

# 1 Surrogates Underpin Ecological Understanding and Practice

2  
3 LUKE S. O'LOUGHLIN<sup>1\*</sup>, DAVID B. LINDENMAYER<sup>1</sup>, MELINDA D. SMITH<sup>2</sup>,  
4 MICHAEL R. WILLIG<sup>3</sup>, ALAN K. KNAPP<sup>2</sup>, KIM CUDDINGTON<sup>4</sup>, ALAN HASTINGS<sup>5</sup>,  
5 CLAIRE N. FOSTER<sup>1</sup>, CHLOE F. SATO<sup>1</sup>, MARTIN J. WESTGATE<sup>1</sup>, PHILIP S.  
6 BARTON<sup>1</sup>

7  
8 <sup>1</sup>Fenner School of Environment and Society, The Australian National University, Canberra,  
9 ACT 2601, Australia

10 <sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, Graduate Degree Program in Ecology, Colorado State University,  
11 Fort Collins, CO, 80523, USA

12 <sup>3</sup>Center for Environmental Sciences & Engineering and Department of Ecology &  
13 Evolutionary Biology, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269-4210 USA

14 <sup>4</sup>Department of Biology, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON, N2L 3G1, Canada

15 <sup>5</sup>Department of Environmental Science and Policy, University of California, Davis, CA  
16 95616, USA

17 \*corresponding author: luke.oloughlin@anu.edu.au

A surrogate is a proxy measure for an attribute of true interest that is too difficult or costly to measure directly. Surrogacy is widely used in the environmental sciences, as well as in other disciplines such as clinical medicine and pharmacology (Lindenmayer et al. 2015a; Barton et al. 2015). In medicine, for example, easily-quantified properties of blood (such as cholesterol level) are regularly used to infer a patient's health, risk of disease, or response to a medical treatment (Barton et al. 2015). Similarly, ecologists often monitor attributes such as carbon stocks, species richness or vegetation structure to infer the overall state of biodiversity, risk of undesired change, or response to a management intervention (Lindenmayer et al. 2015a).

Surrogates are often used in applied ecology to inform decisions about biodiversity management, atmospheric pollution and conservation reserve selection (e.g. Rodrigues and Brooks 2007). However, proxy measures are also used widely in fundamental ecology. Ecosystem properties like productivity, fire severity and water quality are almost exclusively inferred from related but indirect measures (e.g. Keeley 2009). This implicit use of surrogacy is often not acknowledged outside of the applied disciplines. The conceptual and analytical frameworks developed to improve surrogacy in applied contexts therefore have much to offer research in fundamental ecology. Similarly, the causal frameworks and search for mechanism in fundamental ecology has much to offer applied surrogacy. In our view, integrating and communicating the lessons from each will lead to better outcomes for both.

Here we consider how fundamental tenets from surrogate research, particularly those that deal with intrinsic uncertainty and risk, are underappreciated in broader ecological research. Our assertion is that explicit recognition of the use of surrogates will benefit all ecological research through improved evaluation of the accuracy, consistency and certainty of the inferences drawn from measures, regardless of the context.

## Understanding the limits of surrogacy

Financial, temporal or logistical constraints may prohibit the direct measurement of a target of interest (Lindenmayer et al. 2015a), meaning statistically robust and informative surrogate measures are needed to make inferences about unmeasured quantities (see Lindenmayer et al. 2015b). Research on evaluating and validating surrogates has led to many positive outcomes for applied conservation, including early identification of ecosystem collapse, insights into rarely observed threatened species, and improved capacity to make effective management decisions (e.g. Rowland et al. 2018). However, surrogates are not perfect, and many surrogates may fail to provide useful information about a target of interest under some conditions, with potentially negative consequences. In medical research, for example, a relationship between arrhythmia and myocardial infarction led to the use of arrhythmia-suppressing drugs that ultimately increased death rates (Buyse and Molenberghs 1998). This example, as well as many others, provided a strong imperative for the development of reliable, accurate and informative surrogates in medicine.

Evaluating surrogates in applied ecology is also important to ensure they provide useful information about a target. For instance, taxon-based surrogate schemes typically make an *a priori* selection of a surrogate (e.g. a particular bird species) assuming it is correlated with a target (e.g. the status of a broader avian assemblage) (Lindenmayer et al. 2002). However, these relationships may be strongly non-linear, scale-dependent, context-specific, or simply not present, such that the surrogate is informative and related to targets under some conditions, but not others (e.g. Westgate et al. 2014). Understanding the mechanisms and theoretical underpinnings of surrogate-target relationships is essential to define the conditions

under which a surrogate will be informative. Importantly, identifying where surrogates fail to provide the intended information about a target provides opportunities to develop new knowledge regarding causal mechanisms. Careful evaluation of surrogacy creates opportunities to improve understanding of the circumstances for which ecological relationships persist to the benefit of both fundamental and applied ecology.

### **Implicit use of surrogates in ecology**

Surrogates have long been an important component of fundamental ecological research, although this is often not acknowledged. Many of the standard approaches for measuring key attributes of ecosystems are proxies for targets that are mostly unmeasurable. For instance, there is a wealth of fundamental research on the biotic and abiotic drivers of productivity, and how productivity drives other biological patterns, across a diverse array of ecosystems (see Zhu et al. 2016). However, there is often no practical way to directly measure total productivity, and so other measures such as chlorophyll A, leaf litter biomass, or remotely sensed metrics (e.g. Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI)), are used as proxies. Although the use of established surrogates for an ecosystem attribute like productivity has tremendous value, it is naïve to think that the use of surrogates does not involve uncertainty or risk, or present other problems associated with indirect measures and inference.

A key problem with the unacknowledged use of surrogates in fundamental ecology is that it ignores the variability, error and context-dependency inherent in the use of a proxy, thereby oversimplifying or potentially leading to a false level of confidence in results (Johnson and Lidström 2018). For example, NDVI is increasingly being used to test how forest productivity influences fauna because the link between NDVI and productivity is considered

well-established (Pettorelli et al. 2005). However, the key empirical research that supports NDVI as a robust surrogate for forest productivity shows wide-ranging correlations ( $r$  between 0.25–0.99) between NDVI and other measures of productivity (tree ring width, tree height, and litterfall) that are themselves often surrogates (Wang et al. 2004). Thus, there exists variation associated with both the context in which the relationship is determined, and then where it is applied. Yet, NDVI is typically used without acknowledgement of uncertainty in how accurately it represents productivity, or that the relationship between NDVI and productivity requires contextual validation.

The implicit use of surrogacy in fundamental research is by no means limited to productivity and includes widely-used proxies for many well-researched ecological processes, patterns or attributes. For instance, fire severity is a complex disturbance process related to the removal of plant biomass as a function of properties of a particular fire (e.g. burn size, temperature, length) that is almost exclusively represented by simple measures like “scorch height” or “minimum twig diameter” (Keeley 2009). The abundance of particular carnivore species will often be inferred from counts of scats or tracks rather than direct observations (Heinemeyer et al. 2008). Thus, while researchers may present an assessment of the change in predator abundance in response to fire severity (and the uncertainty in that inference), what they may have actually modelled is a shift in scat density relative to fire “scorch height”, without recognition of the uncertainty of those surrogate-target inferences. In much of fundamental ecology, the simple measures used to infer these, and other complex targets (e.g. ecological niche breadth, disturbance intensity, environmental stress, resilience), are described but rarely acknowledged as surrogates.

**Surrogates as a bridge between fundamental and applied ecology**

125

126 A common perception in ecology is that fundamental and applied research are quite separate  
127 disciplines and that surrogate research is a sub-component of applied ecology (Fig. 1a). A  
128 related idea is that knowledge transfer from fundamental to applied research is of greater  
129 importance than knowledge transfer in the opposite direction (Courchamp et al. 2015) (Fig.  
130 1a). We suggest that this model does not reflect the reality of surrogate use across both fields  
131 of research, under-represents the diversity of surrogate research, and fails to consider the  
132 importance of knowledge transfer from surrogate to fundamental research (Fig. 1b). We  
133 propose that greater awareness of surrogates has the potential to increase the connection  
134 between fundamental and applied ecology, improve applied surrogacy through greater  
135 appreciation of mechanisms and theory, and strengthen fundamental research through greater  
136 acknowledgement of the need to evaluate and validate surrogate-target relationships.

137

138 We recognise that almost every association in ecological science includes considerable  
139 variability, error and context-dependency. Although a practical need to synthesize complexity  
140 into generalized theory exists, de-emphasizing uncertainty risks misinterpretation and  
141 overconfidence in inferred relationships (Johnson and Lidström 2018). This is where  
142 improved recognition of surrogate use in ecological research would be of greatest benefit.

143 The surrogate literature offers approaches, tools and language to account for and  
144 communicate the uncertainty intrinsic to using a measure of one entity to make an inference  
145 about another (see Lindenmayer et al. 2015b). Adopting the frameworks for evaluating and  
146 validating surrogates allows researchers to quantitatively formalize trade-offs between  
147 accuracy and cost-effectiveness, and more clearly justify the use of surrogates, whatever the  
148 context.

149

We contend that the use of surrogates should serve as an important bridge between the fields of fundamental and applied ecology. Ecosystems are complex and surrogates are used to inform targets, irrespective of whether the target is a mechanistic process or the outcome of a conservation management intervention. Ecologists should seize the opportunity to clearly recognize surrogates in their research and appreciate that their research may speak to a much broader audience. Uniting theory and practice through a greater emphasis on surrogate ecology is particularly important for a changing world in which anthropogenic factors are increasingly determining the structure and functioning of ecosystems.

## **Acknowledgements**

The work reported in this paper was funded by an Australian Research Council fellowship awarded to DBL. MRW was funded in part from a grant from the US National Science Foundation (DEB-1546686).

## **References cited**

- Barton PS, Pierson JC, Westgate MJ, Lane PW, Lindenmayer DB. 2015. Learning from clinical medicine to improve the use of surrogates in ecology. *Oikos* 124: 391–398.
- Buyse M, Molenberghs G. 1998. Criteria for the validation of surrogate endpoints in randomized experiments. *Biometrics* 54: 1014–1029.
- Courchamp F, Dunne JA, Le Maho Y, May RM, Thébaud C, Hochberg ME. 2015. Fundamental ecology is fundamental. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 30: 9–16.
- Heinemeyer K, Ulizio T, Harrison R. 2008. Natural sign: tracks and scats. In: Long R, MacKay P, Zielinski W, Ray J (eds) *Noninvasive survey methods for carnivores*. Island Press, Washington, pp 45–75

175 Johnson AF, Lidström S. 2018. The balance between concepts and complexity in ecology.  
 176 Nature Ecology & Evolution 2: 585.

177 Keeley JE. 2009. Fire intensity, fire severity and burn severity: A brief review and suggested  
 178 usage. International Journal of Wildland Fire 18: 116–126.

179 Lindenmayer D, Barton P, Pierson J, (eds). 2015a. Indicators and Surrogates of Biodiversity  
 180 and Environmental Change. CSIRO Publishing, Melbourne

181 Lindenmayer D, Pierson J, Barton P et al. 2015b. A new framework for selecting  
 182 environmental surrogates. Science of The Total Environment 538: 1029–1038.

183 Lindenmayer DB, Manning AD, Smith PL, Possingham HP, Fischer J, Oliver I, McCarthy  
 184 MA. 2002. The focal species approach and landscape restoration: a critique.  
 185 Conservation Biology 16: 338–345.

186 Pettorelli N, Vik JO, Mysterud A, Gaillard JM, Tucker CJ, Stenseth NC. 2005. Using the  
 187 satellite-derived NDVI to assess ecological responses to environmental change. Trends  
 188 in Ecology and Evolution 20: 503–510.

189 Rodrigues ASL, Brooks TM. 2007. Shortcuts for Biodiversity Conservation Planning: The  
 190 Effectiveness of Surrogates. Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics 38:  
 191 713–737.

192 Rowland JA, Nicholson E, Murray NJ, Keith DA, Lester RE, Bland LM. 2018. Selecting and  
 193 applying indicators of ecosystem collapse for risk assessments. Conservation Biology  
 194 DOI:10.1111/cobi.13107.

195 Wang J, Rich PM, Price KP, Kettle WD. 2004. Relations between NDVI and tree  
 196 productivity in the central Great Plains. International Journal of Remote Sensing 25:  
 197 3127–3138.


198 Westgate MJ, Barton PS, Lane PW, Lindenmayer DB. 2014. Global meta-analysis reveals  
 199 low consistency of biodiversity congruence relationships. Nature Communications 5:



853–858.

Zhu Z, Piao S, Myneni RB et al. 2016. Greening of the Earth and its drivers. *Nature Climate Change* 6: 791–795.

*Luke S. O’Loughlin (luke.oloughlin@anu.edu.au), David B. Lindenmayer, Claire N. Foster, Chloe N. Sato, Martin J. Westgate and Philip S. Barton are affiliated with the Fenner School of Environment and Society at the Australian National University. Melinda D. Smith and Alan K. Knapp are affiliated with the Department of Biology, Graduate Degree Program in Ecology at Colorado State University. Michael R. Willig is affiliated with Center for Environmental Sciences & Engineering and the Department of Ecology & Evolutionary Biology at the University of Connecticut. Kim Cuddington is affiliated with the Department of Biology at the University of Waterloo. Alan Hastings is affiliated with the Department of Environmental Science and Policy at the University of California, Davis.*



**Figure 1. Conceptual diagrams representing overlap of ideas and approaches in the distinct disciplines of fundamental, applied and surrogate research. Arrow width indicates the importance of the knowledge transfers between research types. (a) The general perception is that applied research benefits more from fundamental research than vice versa and that surrogate research is a small component of applied research (modified from Courchamp et al. 2015)). (b) We suggest that surrogate research is, in fact, part of both fundamental and applied research, and that the transfer of surrogate knowledge to fundamental ecology is of considerable importance.**